UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,160	10/17/2006	Bodo Asmussen	683105-2US (JA005/2003US)	1716
PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP ONE COMMERCE SQUARE			EXAMINER	
			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103		00	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptomail@panitchlaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/569,160	ASMUSSEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on	the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	(1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the happeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONL MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In a SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Y CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteneset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ed statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS 	nereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prio (a) They raise new issues that would require further considera (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form	tion and/or search (see NOTE below);
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresp NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See	
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable 	e if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided by The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.7-12.14-24 and 27-41. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suffici was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notic entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcon showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and w	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/S 	
13. Other:	υσου τ αρει 140(ο)
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	/MICAH-PAUL YOUNG/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it remains the position of the Examiner that the combination of the prior art continues to obviate the instant claims because the '149 application discloses fast dissolving tablets that are administered orally and dissolve instantly in the mouth [0158]. The '863 patent discloses thin oral tablets comprising a combination of cholinergic substances that dissolves quickly. It would have been obvious to incorporate the drugs of the '863 into the film of the '143 since both applications solve the same problem of fast oral drug delivery. The Applicant argues that the prior art does not inherently teach that their respective composition dissolve within 30 minutes and achieve an optimal plasma concentration. The combination comprises the same components (drug(s) and auxiliaries) combined in the same way (thin films with a thickness of 0.05-1mm) for similar delivery (buccally) to solve the same problem (cognitive disorders). Since a compound and its properties cannot be separated, it remains the position of the Examiner that since the same components are combined they must result function the same way having the same functional limitations. Further the claim recite that an effective plasma level is achieved, while Applicant argues that an optimal plasma level is not achieved by the prior art. Since the claims do not further enumerate what an effective plasma level is, and since the prior art solves the same problem, the prior must achieve this effective plasma level. Further since the claims do not specify what an effective level is, any plasma level would meet this limitation. For these reasons the claims remain obviated.